arXiv:1211.1860v2 [cs.GT] 5 Dec 2012

On the Inefficiency of the Uniform Price Auction [*]

Evangelos Markakis Orestis Telelis

Department of Informatics,
Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece.
{markakis,telelis}@gmail.com

Abstract

We present our results on Uniform Price Auctions, one of the standard sealed-bid multi-unit auction formats, for selling multiple identical units of a single good to multi-demand bidders. Contrary to the truthful and economically efficient multi-unit Vickrey auction, the Uniform Price Auction encourages strategic bidding and is socially inefficient in general, partly because of a "Demand Reduction" effect; bidders tend to bid for fewer (identical) units, so as to receive them at a lower uniform price. Despite its inefficiency, the uniform pricing rule is widely popular by its appeal to the natural anticipation, that identical items should be identically priced. Application domains of its variants include sales of U.S. Treasury notes to investors, trade exchanges over the internet facilitated by popular online brokers, allocation of radio spectrum licenses etc.

In this work we study equilibria of the Uniform Price Auction for bidders with (symmetric) submodular and subadditive valuation functions, over the number of units that they win. For bidders with submodular valuation functions, we investigate pure Nash equilibria of the auction in undominated strategies; we produce a characterization of these equilibria that allows us to prove that a fraction $1-e^{-1}$ of the optimum social welfare is always recovered in undominated pure Nash equilibrium – and this bound is essentially tight. Subsequently, we study the auction under the incomplete information setting and prove a bound of $4-\frac{2}{k}$ on the economic inefficiency of (mixed) Bayes Nash equilibria that are supported by undominated strategies. Finally, for bidders with subadditive valuation functions and under a standard *no-overbidding* assumption (that no bidder outbids his value for any number of units), we prove a slightly worse upper bound of 4 on the inefficiency of mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria (without any restriction on their support). This latter result is shown by an appropriate adaptation of a recent technique introduced in [Feldman, Fu, Gravin, Lucier, `arXiv:1209.4703 [cs.GT]`]. For bidders with subadditive valuation functions and under the stated assumption, we also give a lower bound of almost 2.

---

[*] Work supported by the research project "DDCOD" (PE6-213). The research project is implemented within the framework of the Action "Supporting Postdoctoral Researchers" of the Operational Program "Education and Lifelong Learning" (Actions Beneficiary: General Secretariat for Research and Technology), and is co-financed by the European Social Fund (ESF) and the Greek State.

1 Introduction

We study *Uniform Price Auctions*, a standard *Multi-Unit Auction* format, for allocating multiple units of a single good to multi-demand bidders within a single auction process. Multi-unit auctions are being applied in a variety of diverse trade exchanges, including online sales over the internet held by various brokers [24], allocation of radio spectrum licenses [21], sales of U.S. Treasury notes to investors [25], and allocation of advertisement slots on internet sites [8]. The particular feature of the Uniform Price Auction is a single price for every unit allocated to any bidder; this makes it a proper representative of a wider category of uniform pricing auctions, as opposed to *discriminatory pricing* ones, that sell identical units of a single item at different prices [24, 16]). As observed by Milgrom in [21], resurgence of interest in auction design is owed to a large extent to the success of multi-unit and – particularly – uniform price auction formats. Charging a uniform price for identical items, apart from appealing to the intuitive anticipation that identical items should be identically priced, it eases the worries of proxy agents that bid on behalf of their employers; they do not have to explain why they did not achieve a better price than their competitors.

The design of *mechanisms* for auctioning multiple units of a single good to multi-demand bidders dates back to the seminal work of Vickrey [30]. Since then, three sealed-bid *standard* multi-unit auction formats have been identified in Auction Theory [16][Chapter 2]: the Multi-Unit Vickrey Auction, the Uniform Price Auction, and the *Discriminatory Price* Auction. A significant volume of research in economics has been dedicated to identifying the properties of these standard formats [23, 9, 1, 28, 3]. All three auctions have the same (sealed) bidding format and allocation rule, and have been studied mostly for bidders with *"downward sloping"* (*symmetric submodular* [17]) valuations; these prescribe that the *marginal* value that a bidder has for each additional unit is non-increasing. Therefore each bidder is asked to issue such a non-increasing sequence of *marginal* bids for the k available units. The k highest marginal bids win the auction and each winning bid grants its issuing bidder a distinct unit. The Multi-Unit Vickrey auction charges according to an instance of the Clarke payment rule [6] and is a generalization of the celebrated single-item Second-Price mechanism. The Discriminatory Price Auction charges the winning bids as payments and it is a generalization of the First-Price Auction. The Uniform Price Auction, proposed by Friedman [12], charges per allocated unit the highest rejected (losing) marginal bid. The multi-unit Vickrey Auction for submodular bidders retains the characteristics of the single-item Second-Price Mechanism, i.e., optimizes the Social Welfare and is truthful (it is a –weakly – dominant strategy for every bidder to report his marginal values truthfully). Neither the Discriminatory nor the Uniform Price auctions are truthful; they encourage strategic bidding.

One of the downsides of Uniform Price Auctions is the effect of *Demand Reduction* observed in [23, 9] and formalized in a general model for multi-unit auctions by Ausubel and Cramton [1]. Bidders may have an incentive to shade their marginal bids for some units, only to win fewer ones in a lower uniform price. This effect leads to diminished revenue and inefficient allocations in equilibrium. In particular it is known that the socially optimum allocation cannot be generally implemented in an equilibrium in (weakly) *undominated strategies*. Despite this effect, the variants of Uniform Price Auctions have seen extensive applications, contrary to the Vickrey auction, which has been largely overlooked in practice; implementations of variants of the standard format are offered by several online brokers [1] [24, 15] and are also being used for sales of U.S. Treasury notes to investors since 1992 [25]. We also note, that the Uniform Price Auction does retain some interesting characteristics: overbidding any marginal value is a weakly dominated strategy, and so is any misreport of the marginal bid for the *first* unit.

In this paper we give a detailed account of the properties of undominated pure Nash equilibria of Uniform Price Auctions. Subsequently, we study the economic inefficiency of pure Nash and mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria, incurred by the effect of demand reduction in the former and by demand reduction and incomplete information in the latter.

Contribution. We study pure Nash and (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibria of the Uniform Price Auction. We focus first on bidders with submodular valuation functions and in Section 4 we give a detailed description of (pure) undominated strategies in the standard model of Uniform Price Auctions. Although these properties are mentioned or partially derived in previous works on Uniform Price Auctions, our analysis aims at clarifying some ambiguity between assumptions and implications. Additionally, we give a characterization of a subset of pure Nash equilibria in undominated strategies, that facilitates our analysis of economic inefficiency later on.

---

[1] Among them, `eBay` ceased its own variant in 2009.

In Section 5, we study the social inefficiency of pure Nash equilibria (PNE) for submodular bidders, in undominated strategies, i.e., the Price of Anarchy (PoA) over the subset of such equilibria. We derive an upper bound of $\frac{e}{e-1}$, which states that the auction recovers in (undominated) PNE at least a fraction $1-e^{-1}$ of the welfare of the socially optimal allocation. We note here that the auction does have a socially optimal equilibrium (discussed in Section 3, but not in undominated strategies; undominated PNE are known to be socially inefficient in general. As noted earlier, this is largely due to the effect of *Demand Reduction* [1], whereby a bidder shades his bids for additional units, so as to pay a lower price for the units he wins. Our analysis can thus be viewed as a quantification of this effect. For any number of units $k \geq 9$, we provide an almost matching lower bound, equal to $\left(1-e^{-1}+\frac{2}{k}\right)^{-1}$. We also discuss the social inefficiency of the auction for $k < 9$ units.

In Section 6, we consider (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibria in the *incomplete information* model of Harsanyi. For mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria that emerge from randomized bidding strategy profiles containing only undominated pure strategies in their support, we prove an upper bound of $4-\frac{2}{k}$ on the Price of Anarchy[2].

In Section 7, we move beyond submodular valuations. As noted by Milgrom [21], there has been no previous study of the Uniform Price Auction with bidders that are not associated with submodular functions. We take a first step in this direction and study bidders with subadditive valuation functions. We do not know yet whether pure Nash equilibria exist or not under subadditive valuations. Our result, however, applies for mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria; under a standard no-overbidding assumption [5, 2, 14], we prove an upper bound of 4 on their Price of Anarchy, using an appropriate adaptation of the technique developed recently by Feldman *et al.* [11]. This bound is only slightly worse than the bound of $4-\frac{2}{k}$ shown in Section 6 for submodular bidders, but holds only under the no-overbidding assumption. We also give a lower bound of almost 2.

2 Related Work

Multi-Unit Auctions Uniform Price Auctions have received extensive study within the economics community. Noussair [23] and Engelbrecht-Wiggans and Kahn [9] gave characterizations of pure Bayes-Nash equilibria under the model of independent private values of bidders, drawn from continuous distributions. They also made some initial observations on the effect of demand reduction. Ausubel and Cramton formalized demand reduction for a more general model of multi-unit auctions in [1], that allows also interdependent private values. Bresky showed in [3] existence of pure Bayes-Nash equilibria in the independent private values model (with continuous valuation distributions) for a large class of multi-unit auctions, including all three standard formats.

Item-Bidding and Combinatorial Auctions There has been a growing recent interest in the computer science community in analyzing auction schemes that – although not necessarily truthful – have an appealing simplicity and appear to achieve increased economic efficiency in equilibrium, compared to what is achievable with truthful mechanisms [5, 2, 14, 13, 18]. Our work falls essentially within the premises of these works. And even though the Uniform Price Auction has been a long known auction format in auction theory, this direction has not been explored so far.

Christodoulou, Kovács and Schapira initialized the study of Combinatorial Auctions with *Item-Bidding* (a descriptive term introduced later in [2]), where they proposed that each out of a universe of distinct goods is sold separately in a Second-Price auction, simultaneously with all other goods. Bidders in this game are required to bid separately for each good. They studied this scheme for bidders with *fractionally subadditive* valuation functions, a class of functions that strictly contains the class of submodular functions and is strictly contained in the class of subadditive ones[3] [10, 17]. The authors prove in [5] a bound of 2 for the Price of Anarchy of the *item-bidding* scheme, even for (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibria in the incomplete information mode. They show how pure Nash equilibria can be computed efficiently and describe an iterative best response algorithm the converges to pure Nash equilibria (albeit not in polynomial time). Bhawalkar and Roughgarden showed a bound of $O(\log m)$ for the Price of Anarchy of Bayes-Nash equilibria, when bidders have subadditive valuation functions. They also proved a bound of 2 for the inefficiency of pure Nash equilibria [2] in the same setting. Hassidim *et al.* proved welfare guarantees for a similar combinatorial auction scheme, that incorporated simultaneous First-Price auctions instead of Second-Price ones. First, they proved that a pure Nash equilibrium in this setting exists if and only if a Walrasian equilibrium exists, for the underlying market of indivisible goods. Then they showed upper bounds of 2, $O(\log m)$ and $O(m)$ on the (pure) Price of Anarchy, for fractionally subadditive, subadditive and general valuation functions respectively. For Bayes-Nash equilibria with fractionally subadditive valuations, they showed a bound of 4. Finally, some of these bounds have been improved in a very recent work by Feldman *et al.* [11]. In [11], it has been shown that for Bayes-Nash equilibria and subadditive valuations, the Price of Anarchy is at most 2 for item-bidding with First-Price auctions and at most 4 when Second-Price auctions are used.

---

[2] This improves significantly over a previously shown bound of $O(\log k)$ in [20]

The results of [5, 2, 14] were partially generalized recently by Fu, Kleinberg and Lavi in [13]. They identified a relaxation of the Walrasian equilibrium for markets of discrete goods – termed *Conditional Equilibrium*, which has a natural exposition in terms of the English ascending-price auction. They establish its connection with the *item-bidding* framework for combinatorial auctions and prove that item-bidding has (pure) Price of Anarchy at most 2, for every class of valuation functions when the simultaneous auctions are Second-Price. Very recently, Syrgkanis and Tardos studied in [18] sequential First- and Second-Price auctions, motivated by the practical issue that supply may not be readily available at once. They showed that sequential First-Price auctions are efficient in subgame-perfect equilibrium. In [29] they extended their results in the incomplete information setting. Lucier and Borodin [19] analyzed the social inefficiency at (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibrium, of combinatorial auctions for multiple distinct goods, incorporating *Greedy* allocation algorithms. They showed that these auctions have Price of Anarchy fairly comparable to the approximation factors of the greedy allocation algorithms, for the underlying welfare optimization problem.

Mechanism Design From the mechanism design perspective, Vickrey designed in [30] the first truthful mechanism for auctioning multiple units "in one go", so as to maximize the social welfare. The Vickrey multi-unit auction is computationally efficient for a bounded number of units. Since then, computationally efficient truthful approximation mechanisms for multi-demand bidders were given by Mu'alem and Nisan in [22] and by Dobzinski and Nisan in [7]. These works considered several different classes of valuation functions much more general than symmetric submodular ones. Very recently, Vöcking gave a randomized universally truthful polynomial-time approximation scheme for bidders with general valuations [31] (a universally truthful mechanism is a probability distribution over deterministic truthful mechanisms), thus almost closing the problem. It is worth noting that in these works, the bids are accessed by the allocation algorithms through polynomially-bounded many *value queries* to the bidders, for specific bundles of items (with the exception being the case of k-minded bidders, who have non-zero value for at most k sizes of bundles).

3 Model and Definitions

We consider auctioning k units of a single item to a set $\mathcal{N} = [n]$ of n bidders indexed by $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Every bidder $i \in \mathcal{N}$ has a private valuation defined over the quantity of units he receives i.e. $v_i : [k] \mapsto \Re^+$, where $v_i(0) = 0$ and each v_i is non-decreasing. In this work we consider submodular and subadditive valuation functions:

---

[3] The name "fractionally subadditive" is due to Feige [10]; these functions had been previously described as XOS valuation function in the work of Lehmann, Lehmann and Nisan [17].

Definition 1 *A valuation function* $f : [k] \mapsto \Re^+$ *is called*

- **Submodular** *if for every* $x < y$, $f(x) - f(x-1) \geq f(y) - f(y-1)$.
- **Subadditive** *if for every* x, y, $f(x+y) \leq f(x) + f(y)$.

The class of subadditive functions strictly contains the class of submodular ones. The following are well known facts concerning such functions.

Proposition 1 *Given* $x, y \in [k]$ *with* $x \leq y$,

1. *any submodular valuation function* f *satisfies* $f(x)/x \geq f(y)/y$.
2. *any subadditive valuation function* f *satisfies* $f(x)/x \geq f(y)/(x+y)$.

A valuation function can also be specified by providing the *marginal*value that the bidder obtains when one more unit is added to his current bundle.

Definition 2 *The marginal value of bidder i for obtaining the j-th unit is* $m_i(j) = v_i(j) - v_i(j-1)$.

Hence, a valuation function v_i can be determined by the vector $(m_i(1), ..., m_i(k))$. For submodular valuations, it holds that this vector is nonincreasing, $m_i(1) \geq m_i(2) \geq ... \geq m_i(k)$.

For allocating the items to bidders we will study the *standard Uniform Price Auction*, where bidders are asked to submit only *non-increasing* marginal values for each additional unit. That is, every bidder i is required to declare his whole valuation curve as a bid $\mathbf{b}_i = (b_i(1), b_i(2), \ldots, b_i(k))$, satisfying $b_i(1) \geq b_i(2) \geq \cdots \geq b_i(k)$, where $b_i(j)$ is the declared marginal value of i, for obtaining the j-th unit of the item. A declared bid $b_i(j)$ may differ from the actual marginal value $m_i(j)$. Given a bidding configuration $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_n)$, the allocation algorithm produces an allocation $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}) = (x_1(\mathbf{b}), x_2(\mathbf{b}), \ldots, x_n(\mathbf{b}))$. The (utilitarian) *Social Welfare* under bidding configuration $\mathbf{b}$ is defined as the sum of utilities of all interacting parties, i.e., the bidders and the auctioneer (whose utility equals his revenue). It equals the bidders' total value for the allocation $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})$:

$$SW(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))$$

Uniform Price Auction. The allocation algorithm of the Uniform Price Auction is shown in Figure 1 and is an instantiation of the greedy algorithm described in [17]. Given a bidding configuration $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{b}_n)$ as input, the algorithm simply allocates the k units to the k highest marginal bids. In case of ties, we can assume that there is some arbitrary but fixed tie-breaking rule that resolves them. After the allocation is completed, every bidder i pays a uniform price $p(\mathbf{b})$ per received unit, which equals the highest rejected bid. That is, if under bidding configuration $\mathbf{b}$, bidder i is allocated $x_i(\mathbf{b})$ units in total and the uniform price is $p(\mathbf{b})$, i pays a total of $x_i(\mathbf{b}) \times p(\mathbf{b})$. The utility that i derives under $\mathbf{b}$ is $u_i(\mathbf{b}) = v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})) - x_i(\mathbf{b}) \times p(\mathbf{b})$.

This auction format always admits pure Nash equilibria for submodular bidders, and in fact we can construct an efficient equilibrium as follows: let $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, ..., x_n^*)$ be an optimal allocation[4] of units to the bidders. Consider the profile where any winner i of at least one unit in $\mathbf{x}^*$ bids $\mathbf{b}_i = (m_i(1), ..., m_i(x_i^*), 0, ..., 0)$ and any loser bids the zero vector. It is straightforward to verify that this a Nash equilibrium. However, the strategies of losing bidders in this profile are weakly dominated, as we

```
1. Set $x_i = 0$, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.
2. For $j = 1, \ldots, k$ do:
    (a) $i^* \leftarrow \arg\max_i b_i(x_i + 1)$
    (b) $x_{i^*} \leftarrow x_{i^*} + 1$
3. return x
```

Figure 1: Allocation Algorithm.

---

[4] It is known that for submodular valuations on identical units, the allocation algorithm of the Uniform Price Auction produces an optimal allocation when bidders bid truthfully. This property does not hold in the case of non-identical items, where only a 2-approximation is achieved [17]

shall see (nevertheless, Nash equilibria in undominated strategies also exist [16]).

Apart from these qualities, an effect known as *demand reduction* does occur in undominated equilibria of this auction format. Bidders may have an incentive to understate their marginal increase for the j-th unit onwards, for some $j > 1$ [1]. This implies that equilibria in undominated strategies are generally inefficient. We show that, despite this effect, the Uniform Price Auction does quite well in approximating the optimal Social Welfare.

Incomplete Information Setting. In Sections 6 and 7, we will move to an incomplete information setting, where each bidder faces uncertainty over the other bidders' valuations. In particular, we will assume that every bidder $i \in \mathcal{N}$ obtains his type/valuation function from a finite set V_i of valuation functions, through a discrete probability distribution $\pi_i : V_i \mapsto [0, 1]$ independently of the rest of the biddders; for any particular $v \in V_i$ we write $v \sim \pi_i$ to signify that it is drawn randomly from distribution π_i. The valuation function of every bidder is *private*. A valuation profile $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathcal{V} = \times_i V_i$ is drawn from a *publicly known distribution* $\pi = \times_i \pi_i$, $\pi : \mathcal{V} \mapsto [0, 1]$. We write accordingly $\mathbf{v} \sim \pi$.

Every bidder i knows his own valuation function v_i – drawn from V_i according to π_i, but does not know the valuation function $v_{i'}$ drawn by any other bidder $i' \neq i$. Bidder i may only use his knowledge of π to estimate $\mathbf{v}_{-i}$. Given the publicly known distribution π, the (possibly mixed) strategy of every bidder is a function of his own valuation v_i, denoted by $B_i(v_i)$. B_i maps a valuation function $v_i \in V_i$ to a *distribution* $B_i(v_i) = B_i^{v_i}$, over all possible bid vectors (strategies) for i. In this case we will write $\mathbf{b}_i \sim B_i^{v_i}$, for any particular bid vector $\mathbf{b}_i$ drawn from this distribution. We also use the notation $\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{v}_{-i}}$, to refer to the vector of randomized strategies of bidders other than i, under valuation profile $\mathbf{v}_{-i}$ for these bidders. A *Bayes-Nash equilibrium* (BNE) is a strategy profile $\mathbf{B} = (B_1, \ldots, B_n)$ such that for every bidder i and for every valuation v_i, $B_i(v_i)$ maximizes the utility of i in expectation, over the distribution of the other players' valuations $\mathbf{w}_{-i}$ *given* v_i and over the distribution of i's own and the other players' strategies, $\mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{w}_{-i})}$. That is, for every pure strategy $\mathbf{c}_i$ of i:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i,\\ \mathbf{b} \sim \mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{w}_{-i})}}} \Big[u_i(\mathbf{b})\Big] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i,\\ \mathbf{b}_{-i} \sim \mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}}} \Big[u_i(\mathbf{c}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big]$$

where we use notation $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}$ to denote expectation over the distribution π and over $\pi(\cdot|v_i)$ respectively, i.e., *given* v_i (instead of using $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim \pi}$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i} \sim \pi(\cdot|v_i)}$, since the analysis is always in the context of π and π_i).
Fix a valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ and consider a (mixed) bidding configuration $\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}$, under $\mathbf{v}$. The Social Welfare $SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}})$ under $\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}$ is defined in expectation over the bidding profiles chosen by the bidders collectively from their randomized strategies:

$$SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}} \Big[\sum_i v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))\Big]$$

The *expected* Social Welfare in *Bayes-Nash Equilibrium* is then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v} \sim \pi}[SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}})]$. The socially optimum assignment under valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ will be denoted by $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}}$. The *expected* optimum social welfare is then $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})]$, by slight abuse of notation. Under these definitions, we will be studying the *Bayesian Price of Anarchy*, i.e. the worst case ratio $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})]/\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}})]$ over all possible distributions π and Bayes-Nash equilibria $\mathbf{B}$.

4 Undominated Equilibria

For the sections 4-6, we consider only bidders with submodular valuation functions, so that $m_i(1) \geq \ldots \geq m_i(k)$, for every bidder i. As already explained in Section 3, the bidding interface of the Uniform Price Auction requires that each bidder submits a sequence of non-increasing marginal bids (see e.g., the related chapters in [16] and [21]).

Definition 3 *The strategy space of a bidder i consists of all bidding vectors $\mathbf{b}_i$for which $b_i(1) \geq b_i(2) \geq ... \geq b_i(k)$.*

The following is then a direct consequence.

Fact 1 *For any strategy profile $\mathbf{b}$, the price $p(\mathbf{b})$ never exceeds any of the winning bids.*

Lemmas 1 and 2 below state two well known facts about the Uniform Price Auction with submodular bidders (see e.g. [16, 21]). For the sake of clarity and completeness, we state them and prove them here to clarify some ambiguities and emphasize their dependence on Definition 3. Their proofs are provided in **Appendix A**.

Lemma 1 *For bidders with submodular valuations, and for any $j \in [k]$, it is a weakly dominated strategy to declare a bid $b_i(j)$ with $b_i(j) > m_i(j)$.*

An assumption that is recently being used in various other auction formats is that bidders do not overbid their value for a set of goods (e.g., [2, 4, 5, 27]). The justification for this is that such strategies may be dominated by other strategies and hence should be avoided. In our context, this would mean that for a set of r units, $\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_i(j) \leq v_i(r) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} m_i(j)$. We note here that Lemma 1 shows that a weakly undominated strategy in our setting implies a stricter notion of conservative behavior than the usual "no-overbidding" assumption of the literature.
To distinguish from the usual no-overbidding assumption, we call a bidder i who does not bid beyond $m_i(j)$ for any $j \in [k]$ *conservative with respect to marginal bids.*

Lemma 2 *In an undominated strategy, a bidder with a submodular valuation, never declares a bid $b_i(1) \neq v_i(1)$.*

We now give a characterization of a subset of undominated pure Nash equilibria, which will be utilized to analyze the social inefficiency in the next section.

Lemma 3 *Let $\mathbf{b}$ be a pure Nash equilibrium strategy profile of the Uniform Price Auction in undominated strategies for submodular bidders, with uniform price $p(\mathbf{b})$. There exists always a pure Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{b}'$ in undominated strategies, satisfying $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}') = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})$ and:*

1. *$b'_i(x) = m_i(x)$, for every bidder i and every $x \leq x_i(\mathbf{b})$.*
2. *$p(\mathbf{b}') \leq p(\mathbf{b})$ and $p(\mathbf{b}')$ is either 0 or equal to $v_i(1)$ for some bidder i.*

Proof. Since $\mathbf{b}$ is an equilibrium in undominated strategies, for every bidder i we have $b_i(1) = v_i(1)$. Also, $b_i(x) \leq m_i(x)$ for every $x \geq 2$. For every winning marginal bid $b_i(x)$ of any bidder i and for $x = 2, \ldots, x_i(\mathbf{b})$, we may set $b'_i(x) = m_i(x)$ without altering neither the uniform price nor the units obtained by the winners under $\mathbf{b}$. This is because the losing bids remain unchanged whereas the winning bids only increase, hence the price is the same as before. Also, the winners may increase some of their bids but this only affects the round at whch they win a unit and not the total number of the units won. Finally, the new profile is easily shown to be an equilibrium simply because we started with an equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$. Thus the first condition $b'_i(x) = m_i(x)$ for $x \leq x_i(\mathbf{b})$ can be satisfied for every winner i.

For the second condition, consider an equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$ satisfying the first condition. Assume that $\mathbf{b}$ is such that $p(\mathbf{b}) = b_i(j)$, for some $j \geq 1$. If $j = 1$, then it must be $x_i(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and then $p(\mathbf{b}) = b_i(1) = v_i(1)$, because $\mathbf{b}$ is undominated. Consider the case where $j \geq 2$. Then $x_i(\mathbf{b}) \geq 1$. If the value $b_i(j) = p(\mathbf{b})$ is *unique* in $\mathbf{b}$, then either $p(\mathbf{b}) = 0$, or i could lower all his marginal bids for the j-th unit and onwards to 0. This way, he would strictly increase his utility, by lowering the uniform price to the next highest marginal bid, which contradicts that $\mathbf{b}$ is a PNE. Thus we may assume that more than one highest losing bids of the same value exist, that determine the price. If none of them are equal to $v_i(1)$ for some i, we can zero out the bids of all bidders who have the highest losing bid (from that bid onwards) and again obtain a bidding configuration $\mathbf{b}'$

with a price $p(\mathbf{b}') < p(\mathbf{b})$. The new vector $\mathbf{b}'$ is still an undominated PNE. Although the utilities of all winners have increased, none of them may increase his utility more by deviating unilaterally, because we have not altered any of the winning bids. It is the last winning bid that will determines the new uniform price in case of any bidder trying to win a unit by deviating. But since there was no incentive to do such a deviation under $\mathbf{b}$ the same is true for $\mathbf{b}'$ too. Hence, we have managed to reduce the price and have some bidders zero out their losing bids. We can repeat this procedure for the configuration $\mathbf{b}'$, until we reach a a configuration satisfying the second property. ☐

5 Inefficiency of Undominated Pure Nash Equilibria

In this section we present welfare guarantees for pure Nash equilibria in undominated strategies, of the Uniform Price Auction, concerning submodular valuation functions. We introduce first some notation, to be used throughout the section. Given a configuration $\mathbf{b}$, we will denote the winning bids by $\beta_j(\mathbf{b})$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, so that $\beta_1(\mathbf{b}) \leq \beta_2(\mathbf{b}) \leq \cdots \leq \beta_k(\mathbf{b})$. We also extend this notation to partial configurations $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ for any bidder $i \in \mathcal{N}$. In relation to this notation we prove the following lemma, which applies to conservative bidders with respect to marginal bids.

Lemma 4 *Let $\mathbf{b}$ denote an arbitrary conservative pure bidding profile and let $\mathbf{x}$ denote an arbitrary assignment of k units to n bidders. Then: $\sum_i \sum_{j=1}^{x_i} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq SW(\mathbf{b})$.*

Proof. Because $\sum_i x_i = k$ and $\beta_1(\mathbf{b}) \leq \cdots \leq \beta_k(\mathbf{b})$, we have:

$$\sum_i \sum_{j=1}^{x_i} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq \sum_i v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})) = SW(\mathbf{b}).$$

where the second inequality is due to the bidders being conservative w.r.t. marginal bids. ☐

Let $\mathbf{x}^* = (x_1^*, \dots, x_n^*)$ be a socially optimum allocation and $\mathbf{b}$ be a bidding configuration corresponding to an undominated pure Nash equilibrium of the auction. Under $\mathbf{b}$ the allocation is $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}) = (x_1(\mathbf{b}), \dots, x_n(\mathbf{b}))$. To simplify notation we use $\mathbf{x}$ for $\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})$ and x_i for $x_i(\mathbf{b})$. Given any allocation $\mathbf{x}$, define the set $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}) = \{i | x_i \geq 1\}$ to be the subset of *winners*, i.e. bidders that receive at least one item unit. We also define 3 additional sets, $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$, all with reference to $\mathbf{x}^*$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*) | x_i \geq x_i^*\}, \quad \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}) = \{i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*) | x_i < x_i^*\},$$

and $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}) \setminus \Big(\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})\Big)$.

We note that given any assignment $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})$ for a pure Nash equilibrium configuration $\mathbf{b}$, $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$ is a partition of $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x})$, given the assumption of undominated strategies about $\mathbf{b}$; every winner $i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ will still be a winner also under $\mathbf{b}$, because of specifying his $v_i(1)$ truthfully (by Lemma 2), thus obtaining at least one unit. Hence none of $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})$, $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$ may contain non-winning bidders of $\mathbf{x}$.

First we are going present a general upper bound on the Price of Anarchy for undominated pure Nash equilibria.

Lemma 5 *Let $\mathbf{b}$ denote any undominated pure Nash equilibrium of a Uniform Price Auction for k units and $\mathbf{x}^*$ be an assignment that maximizes the social welfare. The Price of Anarchy is:*

$$PoA \leq \sup_{\mathbf{b}} \max_{i: x_i^* - x_i(\mathbf{b}) > 0} \left[v_i(x_i^*) \cdot \left(v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big) + \sum_{j=1}^{x_i^* - x_i(\mathbf{b})} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \right)^{-1} \right] \tag{1}$$

The proof of the lemma is given in **Appendix B**. We can now present our constant bound on the Price of Anarchy:

Theorem 1 *The Uniform Price Auction recovers in undominated pure Nash equilibrium a fraction of at least* $1 - e^{-1}$ *of the optimal Social Welfare, for multi-demand bidders with symmetric submodular valuations.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, it suffices to upper bound the social inefficiency of undominated equilibria satisfying the properties of lemma 3. Let $p(\mathbf{b})$ be the uniform price payed under equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$, i.e. the value of the highest losing (marginal) bid. In order to estimate a lower bound on the Social Welfare of $\mathbf{b}$, we consider possible deviations of players $i \in \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}))$. We may assume that $\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})) \neq \emptyset$ for, otherwise, $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b})) = \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ and $\mathbf{b}$ is socially optimum, i.e. $SW(\mathbf{b}) = SW(\mathbf{x}^*)$.

For every player $i \in \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}))$, define $r_i(\mathbf{b}) = x_i^* - x_i(\mathbf{b})$. For every bidder $i \in \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}))$ and for every value $j = 1, \dots, r_i(\mathbf{b})$, there exists a deviation that will grant him j additional units to the ones he already wins under $\mathbf{b}$; this is justified by the fact that at equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$, all bidders play marginal bids at most equal to their true marginal valuations. Since, the optimal assignment results from a simple sort of the real marginal values, every winner $i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ may feasibly deviate under $\mathbf{b}$ so as to obtain a total number of units between x_i and x_i^*. A deviation of $i \in \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{b}))$ for obtaining any number of $j = 1, \dots, r_i(\mathbf{b})$ *additional* units will raise the uniform price to exactly $\beta_j(\mathbf{b})$ (using lemma 3) and cannot be profitable for i, i.e.:

$$v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}) + j) - (x_i(\mathbf{b}) + j) \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})) - x_i(\mathbf{b}) \cdot p(\mathbf{b})$$

To simplify notation, we use hereafter x_i for $x_i(\mathbf{b})$, p for $p(\mathbf{b})$, r_i for $r_i(\mathbf{b})$, and β_j for $\beta_j(\mathbf{b})$, (always with respect to an undominated pure Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$).

Then we deduce that for every $i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*)$:

$$\beta_j \geq \frac{1}{j + x_i} \cdot \Big(v_i(x_i + j) - v_i(x_i) + x_i \cdot p\Big), \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, r_i \tag{2}$$

We can now proceed to upper bound (1) from lemma 5, using (2) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
v_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \beta_j &\geq v_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{1}{j + x_i} \cdot \Big(v_i(x_i + j) - v_i(x_i)\Big) & (3)\\
&= v_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \left(\frac{j}{j + x_i} \cdot \frac{v_i(x_i + j) - v_i(x_i)}{j}\right) \\
&\geq v_i(x_i) + \frac{v_i(x_i^*) - v_i(x_i)}{x_i^* - x_i} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{j}{j + x_i} & (4)\\
&= v_i(x_i) + \frac{v_i(x_i^*) - v_i(x_i)}{x_i^* - x_i} \cdot \left(x_i^* - x_i - x_i \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{1}{j + x_i}\right) \\
&= v_i(x_i^*) - \frac{v_i(x_i^*) - v_i(x_i)}{x_i^* - x_i} \cdot x_i \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{1}{j + x_i} & (5)\\
&\geq \left(1 - \frac{x_i}{x_i^*} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{r_i} \frac{1}{j + x_i}\right) \cdot v_i(x_i^*) \geq \left(1 - \frac{x_i}{x_i^*} \cdot \int_{x_i}^{x_i^*} \frac{1}{y} dy\right) \cdot v_i(x_i^*) & (6)\\
&= \left(1 + \frac{x_i}{x_i^*} \cdot \ln \frac{x_i}{x_i^*}\right) \cdot v_i(x_i^*) \geq (1 - e^{-1}) \cdot v_i(x_i^*) & (7)
\end{aligned}$$

(3) occurs by substitution of β_j from (2) and after dropping the $x_i \cdot p \geq 0$ term. (4) follows by submodularity of the valuation functions, particularly that $\frac{v_i(x_i+j)-v_i(x_i)}{j} \geq \frac{v_i(x_i^*)-v_i(x_i)}{x_i^*-x_i}$, for any $j = 1, \dots, r_i$ where $r_i = x_i^* - x_i$. For (6) we used $\frac{v_i(x_i^*)-v_i(x_i)}{x_i^*-x_i} \leq \frac{v_i(x_i^*)}{x_i^*}$, given $v_i(0) = 0$; we bounded

the sum of harmonic terms with the integral, using $\sum_{k=m}^{n} f(k) \leq \int_{m-1}^{n} f(x)dx$, for a monotonically decreasing positive function. We obtain the final result by minimizing $f(y) = 1 + y \ln y$ over $(0, 1)$ for $y = e^{-1}$. The claimed bound for the PoA follows by lemma 5. $\square$

We will produce an almost matching lower bound for the result of theorem 1, which holds for any number of units $k \geq 9$. We pause here to discuss first a simple tight example for the case of 3 units.

Example for $k = 3$. We give a simple lower bound of $\frac{18}{13}$. Consider 3 item units and 3 bidders, with valuations $v_1(x) = x$, $v_2(x) = \frac{2}{3}$, $v_3(x) = \frac{1}{2}$. The socially optimum welfare is 3, where bidder 1 gets all the units. Consider the pure Nash equilibrium configuration $\mathbf{b}_1 = (1, 0, 0)$, $\mathbf{b}_2 = (\frac{2}{3}, 0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{b}_3 = (\frac{1}{2}, 0, 0)$, for $j = 1, 2, 3$. None of bidders 2 and 3 have incentive to change their bid, as their utility cannot improve. Should bidder 1 raise $b_1(2) = 0$ to $b'_1(2) > \frac{1}{2}$, he would win one more unit additionally to $x_1(\mathbf{b}) = 1$, but pay $x_1(\mathbf{b}') \times \frac{1}{2} = 1$, thus not improving his utility. If bidder 1 would raise $b_1(2) = 0$ to $b'_1(2) > \frac{2}{3}$ and $b_1(3) = 0$ to $b'_1(3) > \frac{1}{2}$, he would still not improve his utility; it would be $u_1(\mathbf{b}') = v_1(x_i(\mathbf{b}')) - x_i(\mathbf{b}') \times \frac{2}{3} = 3 - 3 \times \frac{2}{3} = 1 = u_1(\mathbf{b})$. The Price of Anarchy in this example is $\frac{18}{13}$.

A similar example for $k = 2$ and, $v_1(x) = x$ and $v_2(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ yields a Price of Anarchy of $\frac{4}{3}$. Both these examples can be shown to be tight, by explicit treatment of (3) and usage of submodularity. The following more general lower bound is valid for at least $k \geq 9$ units. For the remaining values of k in between, (3) does not seem to yield a tight upper bound (and we do not have simple lower bounds).

Theorem 2 *For any $k \geq 9$, the Uniform Price Auction recovers in undominated pure Nash equilibrium at most a factor $(1 - e^{-1} + \frac{2}{k})$ of the optimum social welfare, even for 2 submodular bidders.*

Proof. Consider $k \geq 9$ units and 2 bidders. For $q = \lfloor e^{-1} \cdot k - 1 \rfloor$ (notice that $q \geq 1$) define the valuations to be:

$$v_1(x) = x \qquad \text{and} \qquad v_2(x) = \begin{cases} x - q \cdot (H_k - H_{k-x}) & x \leq k - q \\ k - q \cdot (1 + H_k - H_q) & x > k - q \end{cases}$$

where H_m is the m-th harmonic number. Notice that the marginal values of bidder 2 are equal to 0 for $x > k - q$. It can be verified that v_2 is symmetric submodular in x:

$$v_2(x) = x - q \cdot \Big(H_k - H_{k-x}\Big) = \sum_{j=1}^{x} \left(1 - \frac{q}{k - j + 1}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{x} \frac{r - j + 1}{k - j + 1}$$

where $r = k - q$. Then $\frac{r-j+1}{k-j+1} \leq \frac{r-j+2}{k-j+2} = \frac{r-(j-1)+1}{k-(j-1)+1}$, thus $v_2(x) - v_2(x-1) \leq v_2(x-1) - v_2(x-2)$, for $x \leq k - q$; for $x > k - q$, $v_2(x) = v_2(x-1)$, thus v_2 is submodular.

For the optimum social welfare we grant all units to bidder 1, i.e. $\mathbf{x} = (k, 0, \ldots, 0)$ and obtain a total welfare of $SW(\mathbf{x}^*) = k$. For the equilibrium configuration $\mathbf{b}$ we set:

$$b_1(j) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } j \leq q \\ 0, & \text{for } j > q \end{cases} \qquad b_2(j) = \begin{cases} \frac{r-j+1}{k-j+1}, & \text{for } j \leq r = k - q \\ 0, & \text{for } j > r \end{cases}$$

Thus, under $\mathbf{b}$, q units are obtained by bidder 1 and $k - q$ units to bidder 2. We show that $\mathbf{b}$ is a pure Nash equilibrium. Notice that bidder 2 is essentially truthful in this profile and may not increase his bids further so as to obtain another unit (given that he plays undominated strategies). On the other hand, the uniform price is 0 in this setting, so player 2 does obtain the maximum of his utility for the won units. Player 1 also pays the uniform price of 0, so he does not have incentive to drop any of his units. Should player 1 try to retain any $j \leq r$ of the $r = k - q$ units held by player 2, the uniform price would become $\frac{j}{k-r+j}$ and bidder 1 will hold a total of $k - r + j$

units. The marginal gain from bidder 1 obtaining the extra j units is cancelled out by a total payment equal to j; thus bidder 1 does not have incentive to deviate under $\mathbf{b}$.

For the social welfare of $\mathbf{b}$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} SW(\mathbf{b}) &= v_1(q) + v_2(r) &&= q + r - q \cdot \Big(H_k - H_q\Big) \\ &= k - q \cdot \Big(H_k - H_q\Big) &&= k \cdot \Big(1 - \tfrac{q}{k} \cdot (H_k - H_q)\Big) \end{aligned}$$

Then, the Price of Anarchy is at least:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{k}{k \cdot \Big(1 - \frac{q}{k} \cdot (H_k - H_q)\Big)} &= \left(1 - \frac{q}{k} \cdot \Big(H_k - H_q\Big)\right)^{-1} \\ \geq \left(1 - \frac{e^{-1} \cdot k - 2}{k} \cdot \int_{q+1}^{k} \frac{1}{y} dy\right)^{-1} &= \left(1 - \frac{e^{-1} \cdot k - 2}{k} \cdot \ln \frac{k}{\lfloor e^{-1}k - 1 \rfloor + 1}\right)^{-1} \\ &\geq \left(1 - e^{-1} + \frac{2}{k}\right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

where we used $H_k - H_q = \sum_{r=q+1}^{k} \frac{1}{r} \geq \int_{q+1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{y} dy \geq \int_{q+1}^{k} \frac{1}{y} dy$, for monotonically decreasing positive functions; the final derivation follows by $q + 1 \leq e^{-1} \cdot k$ and $\lfloor e^{-1}k - 1 \rfloor + 1 \geq e^{-1}k$ □

6 Bayes-Nash Inefficiency with Undominated Support

In this section we investigate the social inefficiency of (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibria for bidders with submodular valuation functions. Just as in the case of pure equilibria we focused on undominated strategies, in this section we will focus on mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria that are supported by pure undominated strategies. Following [5, 2], to ensure the existence of mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria, we make the assumption of a finite bidding space for bidders under sufficiently fine discretization. We claim that such mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria supported by undominated pure strategies exist for the case of bidders with submodular valuation functions.

Indeed, consider a Bayesian game where the strategy space of each player is bounded (e.g. of the form $[0, U]$, where U is a sufficiently large upper bound on the values of all bidders) and finite, through some sufficiently fine discretization.

We first claim that in our setting there always exists a Bayes-Nash equilibrium where all strategies used in its support are not weakly dominated. Then we will claim that these strategies are conservative w.r.t. marginal bids. To argue about these statements, we use two well known facts from game theory.

The first one is that a Bayes-Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{B}$ can be seen as a Nash equilibrium of a complete information game (see e.g. [26][Chapter 9]), where the set of players is the set of pairs (i, v_i) for every $i = 1, ..., n$ and $v_i \in V_i$, and the strategy space of player (i, v_i) is the same as the strategy space of i in the Bayesian game. For a given mixed strategy profile $\mathbf{B}$ in this game, the utility function of player (i, v_i), denoted by $u_i^{v_i}(\mathbf{B})$, is:

$$u_i^{v_i}(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}, \mathbf{b} \sim \mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i})}} \Big[u_i(\mathbf{b})\Big] = \sum_{\mathbf{v}_{-i} \in \mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b} \sim \mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i})}} \Big[u_i(\mathbf{b})\Big]$$

Note that the utility of a player (i, v_i) does not depend on the action of other pairs that involve i, (i.e., on the other types of player i). Since this complete-information game is a finite game it possesses a mixed Nash equilibrium. It is well known that in any finite game there always exists a mixed equilibrium where no weakly dominated action is contained in the support of each player's strategy (see [26][Section 4.4]). Putting everything together, we have that there always exists a Bayes-Nash equilibrium where every strategy used in its support is not weakly dominated. It is an easy exercise to verify the validity of Lemma 1 for a sufficiently fine discretization of the strategy space and that Lemma 2 holds, for any such discretization that does not exclude the actual marginal values from the bidders' strategy space.

We introduce some auxiliary notation for the analysis that follows. For any valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ let $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}} = (x_1^{\mathbf{v}}, \dots, x_n^{\mathbf{v}})$ denote the socially optimum assignment. For any particular bidder $i \in \mathcal{N}$ let $\mathcal{U}^i \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ denote the subset of valuation profiles $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$ where $x_i^{\mathbf{v}} \geq 1$, i.e., $\mathcal{U}^i = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V} | x_i^{\mathbf{v}} \geq 1\}$; these are the profiles under which i is a "socially optimum winner". Accordingly, we let $\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ denote the subset of "socially optimum winners" in valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$. Given any (pure) bidding profile $\mathbf{b}$, we use the *"operator"* $\beta_j(\mathbf{b})$, to denote the j-th lowest winning bid in $\mathbf{b}$, as in section 5. The following lemma will serve a purpose in the proof of theorem 3 similar to that one of lemma 4 in the previous section. It is a essentially a much more detailed analogue.

Lemma 6 *For a valuation profile* $\mathbf{v}$*, let* $\mathbf{b}$ *denote an arbitrary pure bidding profile in undominated strategies,* $p(\mathbf{b})$ *be the uniform price under* $\mathbf{b}$ *and let* $\mathbf{x}^*$ *be the efficient (socially optimal) assignment of* k *units to* $\ell \leq k$ *winning bidders w.r.t.* $\mathbf{v}$*. Fix an arbitrary ordering of the* ℓ *winning bidders under* $\mathbf{x}^*$ *and define* $t_i = \lceil \frac{x_i^*}{2} \rceil$*,* $i = 1, \dots, \ell$*. Then:*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} t_i \cdot \beta_{t_i}(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq p(\mathbf{b}) + \frac{k-1}{k} \cdot SW(\mathbf{b}) \tag{8}$$

Proof. For the winning bidders $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ we have $x_i^* \geq 1$. Define $X_i = \sum_{j \leq i} x_j^*$. First, we prove by induction on i that:

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq i} t_j \cdot \beta_{t_j}(\mathbf{b}_{-j}) \leq \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq X_i - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}). \tag{9}$$

For the basic step of the induction, consider $i = 1$; then:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1 \cdot \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) &\leq \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + (t_1 - 1) \cdot \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}) \\ &\leq \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{j=t_1}^{2t_1-2} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \\ &= \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{j \leq x_1 - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

For the inductive step, assuming (9) holds for $i > 1$, we show it remains true for $i+1$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j \leq i+1} t_j \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-j}) &= \sum_{j \leq i} t_j \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-j}) + \Big(t_{i+1} \cdot \beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}_{-(i+1)})\Big) \\ &\leq \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{j \leq X_i - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) + \Big(t_{i+1} \cdot \beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b})\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

At this point we consider two cases:

(i) $\beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}) \leq \beta_{X_i - 1}(\mathbf{b})$. Then $\beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}) \leq \beta_j(\mathbf{b})$, for $j = X_i - 1, \dots, (X_i - 1 + x_{i+1}^*) = X_{i+1} - 1$. Because $t_{i+1} = \left\lceil \frac{x_{i+1}^*}{2} \right\rceil$, the result continues to hold trivially.

(ii) $\beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}) > \beta_{X_i - 1}(\mathbf{b})$. If x_{i+1}^* is even, then $\beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}) \leq \beta_{X_i - 1 + j}(\mathbf{b})$, for $j = \frac{x_{i+1}^*}{2} + 1, \dots, x_{i+1}^*$. If x_{i+1}^* is odd, then, because $\beta_{t_{i+1}} > \beta_{X_i - 1}(\mathbf{b})$, it must hold that $\beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b}) \leq \beta_{X_i - 1 + j}(\mathbf{b})$, for $j = \lceil \frac{x_{i+1}^*}{2} \rceil, \dots, x_{i+1}^*$.

Thus, continuing from (11) we have:

$$\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{j \leq X_i - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) + \Big(t_{i+1} \cdot \beta_{t_{i+1}}(\mathbf{b})\Big) \leq \beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{j \leq X_{i+1} - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \tag{12}$$

which proves (9) for $i = \ell$, thus, $X_\ell = k$.

Now observe that, since bidder 1 has $x_1^* \geq 1$, he must be a winner of at least one unit also under $\mathbf{b}$, because he bids an undominated strategy with $b_1(1) = v_1(1)$. Also, $b_1(1) \geq \beta_{x_1^*}(\mathbf{b})$, i.e., $b_1(1)$ is at least the x_1^*-th bid in $\beta_1(\mathbf{b}), \ldots, \beta_k(\mathbf{b})$. This holds because bidder 1 can in principle obtain all x_1^* units, by raising his marginal bids $b_1(j)$ to $m_1(j)$ as well, for $j = 2, \ldots, x_1^*$. Then it follows that $\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) \leq \beta_{t_1-1}(\mathbf{b})$. Thus, we can conclude that, if $x_1(\mathbf{b}) = 1$, we have:

$$\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) = \beta_1(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) \leq p(\mathbf{b}) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k-1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq SW(\mathbf{b}) - \beta_k(\mathbf{b}).$$

If, however, $x_1(\mathbf{b}) > 1$, it *may occur* that $\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) > p(\mathbf{b})$, but still $\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) \leq \beta_{t_1-1}(\mathbf{b})$. Then:

$$\beta_{t_1}(\mathbf{b}_{-1}) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq X_i - 1} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) \leq SW(\mathbf{b}) - \beta_k(\mathbf{b}).$$

In either case (8) is proven, because $\beta_k(\mathbf{b}) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \beta_j(\mathbf{b}) = v_i(1) \geq \frac{1}{k} \cdot SW(\mathbf{b})$, for some bidder i (and because $\mathbf{b}$ is undominated). $\square$

The following lemma facilitates the expression of BNE conditions regarding unilateral deviations, and has been proved in a different form and under a different context (for simultaneous single-unit auctions with combinatorial bidders) also in [5, 2].

Lemma 7 *For every bidder $i \in \mathcal{N}$ with submodular valuation v_i define the bidding vector $\mathbf{m}_i^{[j]} = (m_i(1), m_i(2), \ldots, m_i(j), 0, 0, \ldots, 0)$. For any conservative bidding profile $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, and for any number of units j: $u_i(\mathbf{m}_i^{[j]}, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq v_i(j) - j \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})$.*

The proof of this lemma for our setting is given in **Appendix C**. Then, we can show the following:

Theorem 3 *The Price of Anarchy of Bayes-Nash Equilibria with undominated support in Uniform Price Auctions with submodular multi-demand bidders is at most $4 - \frac{2}{k}$.*

Proof. Consider a Bayes-Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{B}$. Fix any valuation profile $\mathbf{v} = (v_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) \in \mathcal{V}$ and a bidder $i \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$. For $t_i^{\mathbf{v}} = \left\lceil \frac{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}{2} \right\rceil$, and for any valuation profile $\mathbf{w}_{-i} \in \mathcal{V}_{-i}$ and strategy $\mathbf{b}_{-i} \sim \mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}$, we apply lemma 7. Then, we take the expectation over the randomized strategies of the other bidders and, subsequently, over all valuation profiles $\mathbf{w}_{-i} \in \mathcal{V}_{-i}$, to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w_{-i}}}}[u_i(\mathbf{m}_i^{[t_i^{\mathbf{v}}]}, \mathbf{b}_{-i})]\right] &\geq v_i(t_i^{\mathbf{v}}) - t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w_{-i}}}}[\beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})]\right] \\
&\geq \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right]\right] \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is justified as follows. By independence of π_i, we have $\sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) = \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) \sum_{v_i} \pi_i(v_i) = \sum_{(v_i, \mathbf{w}_{-i})} \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i)\pi_i(v_i) = 1 = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} \pi(\mathbf{w})$. Also, by submodularity (proposition 1) and monotonicity of valuation functions: $v_i(t_i^{\mathbf{v}}) = v_i(\lceil \frac{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}{2} \rceil) \geq \frac{1}{2} v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})$. Because under BNE $\mathbf{B}$ bidder i does not have incentive to deviate:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[u_i(\mathbf{b})]\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w_{-i}}}}[u_i(\mathbf{m}_i^{[t_i^{\mathbf{v}}]}, \mathbf{b}_{-i})]\right]$$

Thus:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i, \mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[u_i(\mathbf{b})]\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right]\right] \geq \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2}$$

We take expectation of both sides over the distribution of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}^i$ and summing over all bidders yields the final expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\Big[u_i(\mathbf{b})\Big]\right] &+ \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\Big[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big]\Big] \\
&\geq \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})] \qquad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

We show in **Appendix C** that the first summand of the left-hand side of (14) can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\Big[u_i(\mathbf{b})\Big]\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_i u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \qquad (15)$$

Similarly, we have for the second summand on the left-hand side of (14):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\Big[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\Big[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big]\Big] &= \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\Big[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big] \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} \sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\Big[t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big] \\
&= \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{\mathbf{w}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{w}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right] \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

By (15), (16) and (14), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_i u_i(\mathbf{b}) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} t_i^{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \beta_{t_i^{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right] \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})]$$

To finish the proof, we substitute the second sum inside the expectation by its upper bound as given by lemma 6 in (8). Notice that $p(\mathbf{b})$ appearing (8) is absorbed by the payment appearing in the utility $u_i(\mathbf{b})$ of at least one bidder. Thus we obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_i v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big) + \frac{k-1}{k}SW(\mathbf{b})\right] \geq \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})]$$

which essentially completes the proof, by $\sum_i v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big) \leq SW(\mathbf{b})$. □

7 Inefficiency for Subadditive Valuation Functions

In this section we examine the social inefficiency at (mixed) Bayes-Nash equilibrium for bidders with subadditive valuation functions. For this class of valuation functions we do not know if the auction does have a pure Nash equilibrium in the complete information setting. To the best of our knowledge, and as mentioned by Milgrom in [21], there has been no previous study of the Uniform Price Auction with bidders associated with valuation functions other than (symmetric) submodular. The nice structure of undominated strategies identified for submodular valuation functions in

Section 4 falls apart, for subadditive valuation functions. In particular, the properties specified by lemmas 1 and 2 are not even compatible with the auction's rule of non-increasing marginal bids. To study the auction's economic inefficiency for bidding profiles that ensure individual rationality, we make the standard "no-overbidding" assumption of *conservative* bidders, that do not overbid their value for any possible quantity of units [5, 2, 14]. In particular we assume that every mixed strategy of every bidder in a Bayes-Nash equilibrium is supported by conservative pure strategies within which overbidding does not occur. Formally:

Definition 4 *A bidder i in a Uniform Price Auction for k units of a single good is conservative, if his strategy space consists of (pure) bid vectors $\mathbf{b}$ satisfying $\sum_{j=1}^{r} b_i(j) \leq v_i(r)$ for $r = 1, \ldots, k$.*

The assumption of conservative bidders, along with the fact that (marginal) bids are required to be non-increasing (as a rule of the auction), transfers to the bidders the responsibility of "*compressing*" their valuation functions into a symmetric submodular bid vector. This effect of the restrictions of the bidding interface was also observed explicitly in [2] and is present in [5, 14], where – in a combinatorial setting with multiple distinct goods – bidders had to similarly compress their (fractionally) subadditive valuation functions into an additive bid vector. Finally, to ensure the existence of mixed Bayes-Nash equilibria, we make the assumption of a finite bidding space for bidders, by using a sufficiently fine discretization, much like in [5, 2].

To facilitate the expression of possible strategic deviations in our analysis of the (mixed Bayes-Nash) Price of Anarchy for subadditive valuation functions, we use an adaptation of a very recently shown lemma, by Feldman *et al.* in [11] (Lemma 5). The authors showed the result in the context of simultaneous item auctions, to improve on the logarithmic inefficiency bound of Bhawalkar and Roughgarden [2].

Lemma 8 *For any distribution $\mathcal{P}$ of a bidding configuration $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ and any subadditive valuation v_i, there exists a conservative bid vector $\mathbf{b}_i$ such that:*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathcal{P}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big)\right] - \sum_{1\leq j\leq x} b_i(j) \geq \frac{1}{2}v_i(x) - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathcal{P}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x}\beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right] \tag{17}$$

for any $x \in [k]$.

The proof of this result is very similar to the proof shown in [11] and is given in **Appendix D**. We can now show that:

Theorem 4 *The Bayes-Nash Price of Anarchy of a Uniform Price Auction with subadditive multi-demand bidders is at most 4.*

Proof. Consider a Bayes-Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{B}$. Fix any valuation profile $\mathbf{v} = (v_i, \mathbf{v}_{-i}) \in \mathcal{V}$ and a bidder $i \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$. Take an arbitrary valuation profile $\mathbf{w}_{-i} \sim \pi_{-i}$ and any bid vector $\mathbf{b}_{-i} \sim \mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}$. Assume that bidder i deviates according to the particular bidding vector $\mathbf{b}_i$ identified in Lemma 8, for $x = x_i^{\mathbf{v}}$. Denote by $p_i(\mathbf{b}_{-i}, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ the uniform price that occurs from this deviation of i. Then:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) &= v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big) - x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \cdot p(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \\ &\geq v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big) - \sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}} b_i(j) \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

We take expectation over the randomized strategies of the other bidders and over all valuation profiles $\mathbf{w}_{-i} \in \mathcal{V}_{-i}$ to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i \\ \mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}}}[u_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\mathbf{b}_{-i})] &\geq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i \\ \mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\mathbf{b}_{-i})\Big)\right] - \sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}} b_i(j) \\ &\geq \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i \\ \mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w}_{-i}}}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right] \\ &\geq \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} - \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b})\right]\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality comes from application of lemma 8 for $x = x_i^{\mathbf{v}}$ and the third one by $\beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \beta_j(\mathbf{b})$ and by independence of π_i, i.e., $\sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) = 1 = \sum_{\mathbf{w}} \pi(\mathbf{w})$. Because under BNE $\mathbf{B}$ bidder i does not have incentive to deviate:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[u_i(\mathbf{b})]\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathbf{B}_{-i}^{\mathbf{w_{-i}}}}[u_i(\mathbf{a}_i^{[j]},\mathbf{b}_{-i})]\right]$$

Thus, by $v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big) \geq u_i(\mathbf{b})$:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big)\right]\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b})\right]\right] \geq \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2}$$

Taking expectation of both sides over the distribution of $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{U}^i$ and summing over all bidders yields the final expression:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))]\right] \\ &+ \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b})\right]\right] \\ &\geq \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} = \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} \frac{v_i(x_i^{\mathbf{v}})}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}[SW(\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{v}})] \qquad (19)\end{aligned}$$

In a similar manner to the proof of theorem 3, we can upper bound each of the left-hand side terms by $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}[SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}})]$. In particular, for the first summand we obtain by the same manipulations as the ones presented in **Appendix C**:

$$\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))]\right] \leq \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v} \\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_i v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b})\Big)\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}})\right]$$

For the second summand, accordingly, we obtain by similar manipulations to the ones used in the proof of theorem 3:

$$\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b})\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{w} \\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{w}}}}\left[\sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{w}}}\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^{\mathbf{v}}}\beta_j(\mathbf{b})\right]$$

which is at most $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{v}}\left[SW(\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}})\right]$, by usage of lemma 4. The result follows. □

We give a lower bound of almost 2. Although our bounds are not tight for the case of subadditive valuation functions, we believe that 2 is the correct answer for the social inefficiency of the auction in this case.

Proposition 2 *The Uniform Price Auction for k units and conservative subadditive bidders has Price of Anarchy at least $\frac{2k}{k+1}$.*

Proof. Take $n = k$ bidders with value functions $v_i(x) = \epsilon$ for $i \geq 3$, $x \geq 1$ and:

$$v_1(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & 1 \leq x \leq k-1 \\ 2 & x = k \end{cases} \quad , \quad v_2(x) = \frac{1}{k} \text{ for } x \geq 1$$

The socially optimum assignment grants k units to bidder 1 and has value 2. Consider the equilibrium $\mathbf{b}_1 = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\mathbf{b}_2 = (\frac{1}{k}, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $\mathbf{b}_i = (\epsilon, 0, \dots, 0)$, for $i \geq 3$. Every bidder obtains 1 unit under $\mathbf{b}$ and the uniform price is 0. This is a pure Nash equilibrium because bidders $i \geq 2$ do not have any conservative deviation to obtain additional units and no bidder has an incentive to drop their won unit. Bidder 1 may deviate to win all units, by bidding e.g. $\mathbf{b}'_1 = (\frac{1}{k-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{k-1}, \frac{1}{k-1})$, but he will pay a uniform price $\frac{1}{k}$ for each of the k units, thus not improving upon his utility of 1 under $\mathbf{b}$. The social welfare of $\mathbf{b}$ is $1 + \frac{1}{k} + (k-2) \cdot \epsilon$ which tends to $\frac{k+1}{k}$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. □

References

[1] L. Ausubel and P. Cramton. Demand Reduction and Inefficiency in Multi-Unit Auctions. Technical report, University of Maryland, 2002.

[2] K. Bhawalkar and T. Roughgarden. Welfare Guarantees for Combinatorial Auctions with Item Bidding. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Disctrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 700–709, 2011.

[3] M. Bresky. Pure Equilibrium Strategies in Multi-unit Auctions with Private Value Bidders. Technical Report 376, Center for Economic Research & Graduate Education - Economics Institute (CERGE-EI), Czech Republic, 2008.

[4] I. Caragiannis, K. Kaklamanis, P. Kanellopoulos, M. Kyropoulou, B. Lucier, R. Paes Leme, and E. Tardos. On the efficiency of equilibria in generalized second price auctions. arxiv:1201.6429, 2012.

[5] G. Christodoulou, A. Kovács, and M. Schapira. Bayesian Combinatorial Auctions. In *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (1) (ICALP)*, pages 820–832, 2008.

[6] E. H. Clarke. Multipart pricing of public goods. *Public Choice*, 11:17–33, 1971.

[7] S. Dobzinski and N. Nisan. Mechanisms for Multi-Unit Auctions. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 37:85–98, 2010.

[8] B. Edelman, M. Ostrovsky, and M. Schwartz. Internet Advertising and the Generalized Second-Price Auction: Selling Billions of Dollars Worth of Keywords. *The American Economic Review*, 97(1):242–259, 2007.

[9] R. Engelbrecht-Wiggans and C. M. Kahn. Multi-unit auctions with uniform prices. *Economic Theory*, 12(2):227–258, 1998.

[10] U. Feige. On Maximizing Welfare When Utility Functions Are Subadditive. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(1):122–142, 2009.

[11] M. Feldman, H. Fu, N. Gravin, and B. Lucier. Simultaneous Auctions are (almost) Efficient. *CoRR*, abs/1209.4703, 2012.

[12] M. Friedman. *A Program for Monetary Stability.* Fordham University Press, New York, NY, 1960.

[13] H. Fu, R. Kleinberg, and R. Lavi. Conditional equilibrium outcomes via ascending price processes with applications to combinatorial auctions with item bidding. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, page 586, 2012.

[14] A. Hassidim, H. Kaplan, Y. Mansour, and N. Nisan. Non-price equilibria in markets of discrete goods. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, pages 295–296, 2011.

[15] T. Kittsteiner and A. Ockenfels. On the Design of Simple Multi-unit Online Auctions. In N. Jennings, G. Kersten, A. Ockenfels, and C. Weinhardt, editors, *Negotiation and Market Engineering*, number 06461 in Dagstuhl Seminar Proceedings, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2007. Internationales Begegnungs- und Forschungszentrum für Informatik (IBFI), Schloss Dagstuhl, Germany.

[16] V. Krishna. *Auction Theory.* Academic Press, April 2002.

[17] B. Lehmann, D. J. Lehmann, and N. Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 55(2):270–296, 2006.

[18] R. Paes Leme, V. Syrgkanis, and É. Tardos. Sequential auctions and externalities. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 869–886, 2012.

[19] B. Lucier and A. Borodin. Price of Anarchy for Greedy Auctions. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 537–553, 2010.

[20] E. Markakis and O. Telelis. Uniform Price Auctions: Equilibria and Efficiency. In *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Algorithmic Game Theory (SAGT)*, pages 227–238, 2012.

[21] P. Milgrom. *Putting Auction Theory to Work.* Cambridge, 2004.

[22] A. Mu'alem and N. Nisan. Truthful approximation mechanisms for restricted combinatorial auctions. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 64(2):612–631, 2008.

[23] C. Noussair. Equilibria in a multi-object uniform price sealed bid auction with multi-unit demands. *Economic Theory*, 5:337–351, 1995.

[24] A. Ockenfels, D. H. Reiley, and A. Sadrieh. *Economics and Information Systems*, volume 1 of *Handbooks in Information Systems*, chapter 12. Online Actions, pages 571–628. Elsevier Science, December 2006.

[25] U.S. Department of Treasury. Uniform-price auctions: Update of the treasury experience, office of market finance. available at `http://www.treasury.gov/domfin`, 1998.

[26] M. J. Osborne. *An Introduction to Game Theory.* Oxford University Press (International Edition, 2009.

[27] R. Paes Leme and E. Tardos. Pure and Bayes-Nash price of anarchy for generalized second price auction. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 735–744, 2010.

[28] P. J. Reny. On the existence of Pure and Mixed Strategy Nash Equilibria in Discontinuous Games. *Econometrica*, 67:1029–1056, 1999.

[29] V. Syrgkanis and É. Tardos. Bayesian Sequantial Auctions. In *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Electronic Commerce (EC)*, 2012.

[30] W. Vickrey. Counterspeculation, auctions, and competitive sealed tenders. *Journal of Finance*, 16(1):8–37, Mar 1961.

[31] B. Vöcking. A universally-truthful approximation scheme for multi-unit auctions. In *Proceedings of the ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 846–855, 2012.

Appendix A: Omitted Proofs from Section 4

Proof of Lemma 1

Fix any bidder i with a submodular valuation function v_i and consider a bidding vector $\mathbf{b}_i = (b_i(1), \ldots, b_i(k))$ of i, where $b_i(1) \geq b_i(2) \geq ...b_i(k)$, as required by the bidding rule of the auction. Suppose that for some j, bidder i overbids the marginal value for the j-th unit, i.e., $b_i(j) > m_i(j)$. We will construct a bidding vector $\mathbf{b}'_i$ and we will show that $\mathbf{b}'_i$ weakly dominates $\mathbf{b}_i$. We define $\mathbf{b}'_i$ as follows: $b'_i(r) = b_i(r)$ for any $r \leq j-1$, and $b'_i(r) = m_i(r)$ for every $r \geq j$. Note that this is a valid bidding vector for the auction. We show that: for every $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, $u_i(\mathbf{b}'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq u_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ and the inequality is strict for at least one vector $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$.

For a configuration $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ of the other bidders, let $p(\mathbf{b})$ denote the uniform price under $\mathbf{b} = (\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$. We start first, with configurations $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ for which $j > x_i(\mathbf{b})$. In this case, if bidder i plays according to $\mathbf{b}'_i$, he will retain at least the same utility, because $b_i(j)$ does not grant him any unit and neither does $m_i(j)$. Hence, he will keep winning under $\mathbf{b}'_i$ the same number of units and if his j-th bid was the price-setting bid, the price may even decrease and he will be strictly better. Consider now configurations $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ for which $j \leq x_i(\mathbf{b})$. We examine the following subcases:

(I): $p(\mathbf{b}) < m_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))$. Then, by playing $\mathbf{b}'_i$, bidder i will still win the same number of units as before. The price under $(\mathbf{b}'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ will either remain the same or may decrease in the case that the price-setting bid was an overbid by bidder i.

(II): $p(\mathbf{b}) = m_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))$. In this case, various scenarios may occur depending on the possible configurations for $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, and on the possible appearance of ties. First, by switching to $\mathbf{b}'_i$, bidder i will either win the same number of units as before, or he may win less if some tie is resolved against him. In the cases that he wins the same number of units as in $\mathbf{b}$, it is easy to see that the price has either remained the same or it may even have fallen (e.g., if the price-setting bid in $\mathbf{b}$ was $b_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})+1) > m_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})+1)$, and this was reduced in $\mathbf{b}'_i$ to $m_i(x_i(\mathbf{b})+1)$). Hence bidder i has at least the same utility as before. In the cases where bidder i wins less units, the only possibility is that the price has remained the same and it is only because of ties that i lost some of his previously won units. But then for the units that he lost, their marginal value is the same as the price, hence bidder i will still have the same utility as before.

(III): $p(\mathbf{b}) > m_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}))$. Then in $\mathbf{b}$, i overpays his marginal value for at least one won unit; in this case bidder i can switch to $\mathbf{b}'_i$ and *strictly increase* his utility. To see this, note that under $(\mathbf{b}'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ bidder i will still win the units that give him nonnegative utility (i.e., have marginal value at least $p(\mathbf{b})$), and he will lose only units that he could not afford anyway.

Conclusively, overbidding any marginal value is a weakly dominated strategy for every bidder i.□

Proof of Lemma 2

By Lemma 1, undominated strategies are conservative w.r.t. marginal bids, thus no bidder may exaggerate his bid for the first unit. Let $\mathbf{b}_i$ denote such a bidding vector for bidder i, where $b_i(1) < m_i(1)$. Let $\mathbf{b}'_i$ denote the bidding vector where $b'_i(1) = m_i(1)$ and $b'_i(j) = b_i(j)$, for $j = 2, \ldots, k$. For any configuration $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$ due to all other bidders, we show that: $u_i(\mathbf{b}'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq u_i(\mathbf{b}'_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ and the inequality is strict for at least one such $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$.

If $x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) \geq 1$, bidder i will maintain his allocation and his utility by increasing $b_i(1)$ to $m_i(1) = b'_i(1)$. If $x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) = 0$, then an increase of $b_i(1)$ to $m_i(1) = b'_i(1)$ will either maintain the utility of i to 0 (if the current minimum winning bid is at least equal to $m_i(1)$), or increase it (if the current minimum winning bid is less than $m_i(1)$). In the latter case, i wins one unit and the minimum winning bid of $(\mathbf{b}_i, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$ becomes the new uniform price that i pays exactly once. Conclusively, bidding $b_i(1) < v_i(1)$ is a weakly dominated strategy. □

Appendix B: Proof of Lemma 5

Let $\mathbf{b}$ be any pure Nash equilibrium configuration in undominated strategies. For simplicity we use x_i for $x_i(\mathbf{b})$ and β_j for $\beta_j(\mathbf{b})$, $j = 1, \ldots, k$. For $SW(\mathbf{b})$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
SW(\mathbf{b}) &= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} \Big(v_i(x_i) - v_i(x_i^*)\Big) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) \quad (20) \\
&= \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1+x_i^*}^{x_i} m_i(j) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1}^{x_i} m_i(j) \quad (21) \\
&\geq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1+x_i^*}^{x_i} b_i(j) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1}^{x_i} b_i(j) \quad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

where (20) emerges simply by analyzing $\sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i)$ and by definition of $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})$, (21) emerges by substituting the appropriate sum of marginal values for the extra value obtained by bidders in $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$ and (22) emerges by the property of undominated bidding strategies given by lemma 1.

Now observe that for every unit missed under $\mathbf{b}$ by any bidder $i \in \mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*) \cap \mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})$, there must exist some bidder $i' \in \mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$ that obtains this unit. If i missed $x_i^* - x_i > 0$ units in pure Nash equilibrium $\mathbf{b}$, there are at least as many bids issued by bidders in $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x}) \cup \mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})$, who obtained collectively these units. The sum of these bids cannot be less than the sum $\sum_{j=1}^{x_i^*-x_i} \beta_j$ of the $x_i^* - x_i$ lowest winning bids in $\mathbf{b}$, (recall that $\beta_j = \beta_j(\mathbf{b})$), $j = 1, \ldots, x_i^* - x_i$. That is:

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1}^{x_i^*-x_i} \beta_j \leq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1+x_i^*}^{x_i} b_i(j) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_2(\mathbf{x})} \sum_{j=1}^{x_i} b_i(j)$$

By (22) we obtain:

$$SW(\mathbf{b}) \geq \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} \Big(v_i(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{x_i^*-x_i} \beta_j\Big) \quad (23)$$

We notice that $\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})$ are a partition of $\mathcal{W}(\mathbf{x}^*)$, thus for $SW(\mathbf{x}^*)$ we have:

$$SW(\mathbf{b}^*) = \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_0(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) + \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}_1(\mathbf{x})} v_i(x_i^*) \quad (24)$$

By (23) and (24) we obtain (1). □

Appendix C: Omitted Proofs from Section 6

Proof of Lemma 7

Fix any player i. For any bidding configuration $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, we let $\beta_1(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \cdots \leq \beta_k(\mathbf{b}_{-i})$ denote the winning bids, if i was not present, in non-decreasing order. Fix also the index j ($1 \leq j \leq k$), and using the submodular valuation function v_i of i, define the bidding vector $\mathbf{m}_i^{[j]} = (m_i(1), \ldots, m_i(j), 0, \ldots, 0)$.

Assume that bidder i has won s units in the configuration $(\mathbf{m}_i^{[j]}, \mathbf{b}_{-i})$. Obviously $s \leq j$. Let p denote the price that he pays for these units. In the case that $s = j$, $p = \beta_j(\mathbf{b_{-i}})$, and the statement of the Lemma trivially holds. In the case that $s < j$, we have that $p = \max\{m_i(s+1), \beta_s(\mathbf{b_{-i}})\}$. This is because the highest losing bid may be either the next bid of bidder i (i.e., $m_i(s+1)$), or the highest losing bid in $\mathbf{b_{-i}}$, which is $\beta_s(\mathbf{b_{-i}})$. This implies that $p \leq \beta_j(\mathbf{b_{-i}})$. Thus we can derive the following bound on the utility of bidder i:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(\mathbf{m}_i^{[j]}, \mathbf{b}_{-i}) &\geq v_i(s) - s \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \\ &\geq v_i(s) - s \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) + \sum_{r=1}^{j-s}(m_i(s+r) - \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})) \\ &= v_i(s) + \sum_{r=1}^{j-s} m_i(s+r) - j \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \\ &= v_i(j) - j \cdot \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality above holds because $m_i(s+r) \leq m_i(s+1) \leq \beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})$ for all marginal values beyond the s-th one. This completes the proof. □

Omitted Part of Proof of Theorem 3

Consider the first of the two summands of (14). We explain the derivations below. We substitute $\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v})$ with $\sum_{\mathbf{v}} \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} \pi(\mathbf{v})$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}$ with $\sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i)$, to obtain (26).

$$\sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{U}^i} \pi(\mathbf{v})\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}[u_i(\mathbf{b})]\right] \tag{25}$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_{i\in\mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}} \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \tag{26}$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}|v_i) \sum_{v_i\in V_i} \pi_i(v_i) \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \tag{27}$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{v_i\in V_i} \pi_i(v_i) \sum_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}|v_i) \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i)\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[u_i(\mathbf{b})\right]$$

$$= \sum_i \sum_{v_i\in V_i} \pi_i(v_i) \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \tag{28}$$

$$\leq \sum_{v\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \sum_i \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{(v_i,\mathbf{w}_{-i})}}\left[u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \tag{29}$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v}) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}\left[\sum_i u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] = \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\mathbf{v}\\ \mathbf{b}\sim\mathbf{B}^{\mathbf{v}}}}\left[\sum_i u_i(\mathbf{b})\right] \tag{30}$$

To obtain (27), we extend the sum over $i \in \mathcal{W}^{\mathbf{v}}$ to a sum over all bidders $i \in \mathcal{N}$, with the understanding that *non-winners* in valuation profile $\mathbf{v}$ contribute only 0 to the social welfare. We move $\sum_i$ to the front and analyze $\sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v})$ to $\sum\limits_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}) \sum\limits_{v_i\in V_i} \pi_i(v_i) = \sum\limits_{(v_i,\mathbf{v}_{-i})} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}|v_i)\pi(v_i)$. For (28) we moved $\sum_{\mathbf{v}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{v}_{-i}|v_i)$ all the way to the right and observe that it equals 1 by independence of the valuation distributions. Finally, we obtain (29) by condensing:

$$\sum_i \sum_{v_i\in V_i} \pi_i(v_i) \sum_{\mathbf{w}_{-i}\in\mathcal{V}_{-i}} \pi(\mathbf{w}_{-i}|v_i)$$

into $\sum_{\mathbf{v}\in\mathcal{V}} \pi(\mathbf{v})$ and moving $\sum_i$ to the right, to sum over the expected valuations of bidders for every valuation profile $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}$.

Appendix D: Proof of Lemma 8

Given the distribution $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, we define the distribution $\mathcal{D}$ of the k highest bids in $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$, $\beta_1(\mathbf{b}_{-i}) \leq \cdots \leq \beta_k(\mathbf{b}_{-i})$; in the sequel we use simply β_j, $j = 1, \ldots, k$, without a reference to $\mathbf{b}_{-i}$. Each of these is a potential uniform price that i might need to pay, depending on his own bid $\mathbf{b}_i$. Moreover, we can assume that i competes against the bid vector $\beta \equiv (\beta_k, \beta_{k-1}, \ldots, \beta_1)$ (we abuse slightly here and in the sequel the notation 'β' without subscript, to denote a vector) and need not bother with bids that are smaller than the k highest. Fix any such vector β from the support of $\mathcal{D}$ and let $T \subseteq [x]$ be a maximal subset of indices, such that: $\sum_{j \in T} \beta_j > v_i(|T|)$. Let $T' = [x] \setminus T$. Then, we claim that:

$$\sum_{j \in T'} \beta_j \leq v_i(|T'|)$$

Indeed, if there exists a subset $R \subseteq T'$ with $\sum_{j \in R} \beta_j > v_i(|R|)$, then, by subadditivity of v_i and monotonicity:

$$v_i(|R \cup T|) \leq v_i(|R|) + v_i(|T|) \leq \sum_{j \in R} \beta_j + \sum_{j \in T} \beta_j = \sum_{j \in R \cup T} \beta_j$$

which contradicts the maximality of T.

Now let us define as β' the vector that is made up from the set of bids $\{\beta_j | j \in [k] \setminus T\}$ in non-increasing order (the remaining $|T|$ trailing components of β' are set to zero). Let $\mathcal{D}'$ denote the distribution of such vectors β'. For any arbitrary bid $\mathbf{b}_i$, we observe that $x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta') \leq x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta) + |T|$. Thus, $v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta')) \leq v_i(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta)) + v_i(|T|)$, by subadditivity and monotonicity of v_i. Using $\sum_{1 \leq j \leq x} \beta_j - \sum_{j \in T'} \beta_j = \sum_{j \in T} \beta_j \geq v_i(|T|)$, we obtain:

$$v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta)\Big) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq x} \beta_j \geq v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta')\Big) + \sum_{j \in T'} \beta_j \tag{31}$$

Thus:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim \mathcal{D}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta)\Big) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq x} \beta_j\right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\beta' \sim \mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta')\Big) + \sum_{j \in T'} \beta_j\right] \tag{32}$$

Now consider $\mathbf{b}_i$ being drawn from the following distribution, $\mathcal{D}''$, that is made from $\mathcal{D}$ (defined above), as follows: for every bid vector $\beta \sim \mathcal{D}$ there is a bid vector $\beta'' \sim \mathcal{D}''$ containing only the bids $\{\beta_j | j \in T'\}$ in non-increasing order; the remaining $k - |T'|$ components of β'' are set to zero. For the analysis that follows, it is important to note that *there exists a (similar) appropriate "truncation" of any bidding vector $\mathbf{c}' \sim \mathcal{D}'$ that yields a vector $\mathbf{c}'' \in \mathcal{D}''$ (the distribution that $\mathbf{b}_i$ comes from).* By (32):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta \sim \mathcal{D}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta)\Big) + \sum_{1 \leq j \leq x} \beta_j\right]\right] \\
&\geq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta' \sim \mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta')\Big) + \sum_{j \in T'} \beta_j\right]\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta' \sim \mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i, \beta')\Big)\right]\right] + \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{D}''}\left[\sum_{1 \leq j \leq x} b_i(j)\right]
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Next we notice that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i\sim\mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\beta')\Big)\right]\right]\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i\sim\mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[2\cdot v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\beta')\Big)\right]\right]=\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[2\cdot v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{c}'',\beta')\Big)\right]\right] \qquad (34)\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{c}'',\beta')\Big)\right]\right]+\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\beta'',\mathbf{c}')\Big)\right]\right]\right)\\
&=\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{c}'',\beta')\Big)+v_i\Big(x_i(\beta'',\mathbf{c}')\Big)\right]\right]\\
&\geq\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta'\sim\mathcal{D}'}\left[v_i(x)\right]\right]=\frac{1}{2}v_i(x) \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}
$$

where from (34) onwards we use "on the fly" the appropriate truncation of vectors $\mathbf{c}'\sim\mathcal{D}'$ noted previously, to obtain $\mathbf{c}''\sim\mathcal{D}''$. The inequality in the last line follows from subadditivity of v_i and $x_i(\mathbf{c}'',\beta')+x_i(\beta'',\mathbf{c}')\geq x$. Thus, putting (33) and (35) together, we derive:

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i\sim\mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\beta\sim\mathcal{D}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\beta)\Big)\right]-\sum_{1\leq j\leq x}b_i(j)\right]\geq\frac{v_i(x)}{2}-\mathbb{E}_{\beta\sim\mathcal{D}}\left[\sum_{1\leq j\leq x}\beta_j\right]
$$

which is equivalent to:

$$
\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_i\sim\mathcal{D}''}\left[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathcal{P}}\left[v_i\Big(x_i(\mathbf{b}_i,\beta)\Big)\right]-\sum_{1\leq j\leq x}b_i(j)\right]\geq\frac{v_i(x)}{2}-\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{b}_{-i}\sim\mathcal{P}}\left[\sum_{1\leq j\leq x}\beta_j(\mathbf{b}_{-i})\right]
$$

and there exists *at least one* $\mathbf{b}_i\sim\mathcal{D}''$ satisfying the stated inequality (17). □